

-7-

Vick *et al.*
Appl. No. 09/475,062**Remarks**

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment to the Claims, claims 1-7, 9-27, and 29-35 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 13, 23, 24, and 25 are independent. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 1, 11, 13, 21, 24, 25, and 29 are sought to be amended. Claims 8 and 28 are sought to be cancelled. Claims 33-35 are sought to be added. No new matter is embraced by this amendment and its entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above Amendment and the remarks set forth below, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner, on page 2 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,678,731 to Howard *et al.* (hereinafter "Howard"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

To anticipate a claim of a pending application, a single reference must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. *Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1397 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The exclusion of a claimed element from the single source is enough to negate anticipation by that reference. *Atlas Powder Co. v. E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 750 F.2d 1569, 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

With regards to independent claims 1, 13, 24, and 25, Howard does not teach or suggest every element of Applicants' claimed invention. For example, Howard does not

teach or suggest Applicants' claimed elements of: creating a user password cookie using a shared secret key, wherein the web server is part of a common authentication ring having a plurality of web servers, each of the plurality of web servers having the shared secret key.

Unlike the present invention, Howard does not teach or suggest a user password cookie or a shared secret key. In fact, Howard teaches away from Applicant's invention of a shared secret key by stating that "[t]he cookies written by an affiliate server are encrypted using a key that is *unique* to the affiliate server, thereby preventing other affiliate servers from reading the data stored in the cookies." *Howard*, col. 7, lines 45-48, see also, col. 7, lines 41-45. Unlike Howard, the web servers of the present invention create a user password cookie using a shared secret key, thus enabling the other web servers in the common authentication ring, when accessed by the user, to read the data stored in the user password cookie. Thus, unlike the present invention, Howard does not teach or suggest creating a user password cookie using a shared secret key, wherein the web server is part of a common authentication ring having a plurality of web servers, each of the plurality of web servers having the shared secret key. Instead, Howard teaches that the key used to encrypt the cookie is unique to the affiliate server, and therefore not shared by any other affiliate server.

With respect to Applicants' independent claim 23, Howard does not teach or suggest Applicants' data structure representing a password cookie comprising the elements of: a user identification (ID); a password; and a time stamp associated with said user ID and password, wherein said password cookie is encrypted using a shared secret key.

-9-

Vick *et al.*
Appl. No. 09/475,062

Unlike the present invention, Howard does not teach or suggest a password cookie or encrypting the password cookie using a shared secret key. As indicated above, Howard teaches that cookies written by an affiliate server are encrypted using a key that is unique to the affiliate server.

Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 13, 23, 24, and 25, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 2-12 and 33-35, 14-22, 31, 32, and 26-30, respectively) are not anticipated by Howard. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1, 13, 23, 24, and 25, and the claims that depend therefrom respectively.

New Claims

New claims 33-35 have been added. Claims 33-35 depend from independent claim 1, and thus, are patentable over the cited reference for at least the reasons stated above.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Crystal D. Sayles

Crystal D. Sayles
Senior Attorney
Intel Americas, Inc.
Registration No. 44,318
(703) 633-6829

Dated: Oct. 14, 2004

c/o Intel Americas, Inc.
4030 Lafayette Center Drive
Building LF3
Chantilly, VA 20151

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below	
By: <u><i>[Signature]</i></u> Scilla Evans	Date: Oct. 14, 2004